



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN ADVOCATE OF PEACE

VOL. LIV.
No. 5.

BOSTON, AUGUST, 1892.

PRICE, \$1.00
A YEAR.

PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

NO. 3 SOMERSET STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

TO J. G. W.

B. F. T.

Herald of life and truth;
Prophet of peace and love;
Strong as the eagle's youth;
Tender as voice of dove.

Trumpet blast comes no more;
Toil of the race is done;
Rest by the quiet shore,
Watch till the setting sun.

Light-beams from heaven's Sun
Break through the mists of death;
Comes to thee His "well done"
Sweet on the Zephyr's breath.

PEACE AND EXPEDIENCY.

BY KATE GANNETT WELLS.

Peace principles have always been hampered by the doctrine of expediency which has been applied to them. Their consistent advocates have been the Quakers and a few individuals here and there, scattered in various countries, and of varying modes of thought in other matters. But as a general rule the peace party, though a name is not always a voucher for the existence of a body of men, has been governed by expediency, and therefore has carried but little weight of influence or of character. It has had a difficult position to occupy and has found more friendliness shown to it when it has talked of arbitration as a method of preventing war than when it has talked of peace as a principle.

It has deprecated war in the abstract and justified particular wars. It always has considered the last war, wherever it may have occurred or for whatever cause, either as unavoidable or necessary, or perhaps righteous; one or the other pretext being alleged. Such temporizing hardly forms an available platform on which to kindle enthusiasm. Of course time slowly changes people's opinions, and many a war once considered right is now called wrong. But we wonder if Fourth of July and spread-eagle-winged patriotism will ever permit an historian to speak of the American Revolution and the American Civil War as two evils which patience, diplomacy and morality could have averted.

Such silent permission will never come until the national virtue of patriotism is merged in the larger one of international equity. Meanwhile local patriotism is fanned by the cheap devices of stump oratory; by the gilded trappings and fine bearing of the conventional State militia and the national army; by military exercises in public schools; by preparations for an increased navy and by skilled inventions for wholesale and speedy slaughter of people in case of war.

In case of war! Just so long as we are always providing for its possibilities, will war continue as a means of gaining an end. If peace is a principle as well as a fact, the principle applies to all cases and all war is wrong.

It is a favorite declamatory assertion that war strengthens the sinews of a nation, purifies its character and develops sturdiness and self-sacrifice. One would suppose that the whole gain was on the side of morality, whereas war impoverishes a nation morally as well as financially. But such a statement, in spite of its truth, falls noiselessly by the side of the brilliant achievements of a regiment or the personal courage of a private soldier.

This supposed national gain must be balanced against the actual individual loss. The individualistic argument has never been more powerfully set forth than in a novel by the Baroness Von Suttner, published two years ago in Germany and lately translated by Alice Abbott of Chicago under the title of "Ground Arms." The authoress is Vice President of the International Peace Congress, and at its last meeting in Rome delivered an address. She has had exceptional advantages for study of the frivolous causes and the terrible miseries of war. Those who are left at home, those who love and bear the agony of suspense, culminating in the death of the individual soldier and the glory of the nation, rebel against the so-called necessity of war. The suffering of the individual, whether it is that of a soldier or of the wife at home, gives the right to deny the justice in any war.

An army has too long been regarded as an impersonal, obedient, aggregate of individuals, none of whom has a right to the disposition of his own life. But the State itself is not an entity, it is composed of individuals who have the right to protest against the commands of a State which orders war in its own name. Such are the lines of individualistic argument in this book, which has made a profound impression in Germany.

The Baroness is right. The individual suffering entailed by war is alone a reason for its never being undertaken. Add to that the individual crime, rapine, brutality; the debased coinage and the indignity and multiplicity of pensions and no war stands justified. The horrors of one battle-field should be sufficient to forever banish war as a method in the settlement of a dispute.

No words yet have ever done justice to the brutality of war. No words, no pictures, nothing but the facts seen